

1 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
 Attorney General of the State of California
 2 DANE R. GILLETTE
 Chief Assistant Attorney General
 3 JULIE L. GARLAND
 Senior Assistant Attorney General
 4 ANYA M. BINSACCA
 Supervising Deputy Attorney General
 5 AMANDA J. MURRAY, State Bar No. 223829
 Deputy Attorney General
 6 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
 7 Telephone: (415) 703-5741
 Fax: (415) 703-5843
 8 Email: Amanda.Murray@doj.ca.gov

9 Attorneys for Respondent

10 . IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 11 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13 **DONALD EVERETT CRONK,**

14 Petitioner,

C 07-05313 TEH

15 v.

16 **ROBERT AYERS, JR., Warden,**

17 Respondent.

**RESPONDENT'S REQUEST
 FOR STAY PENDING
 ISSUANCE OF THE
 MANDATE IN *Hayward***

Judge: The Honorable Thelton E.
 Henderson

19 **INTRODUCTION**

20 Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, contending that his due process
 21 rights were violated by the Board of Parole Hearings' 2005 decision finding him unsuitable for
 22 parole. The Court ordered a response to the Petition. On May 16, 2008, the Ninth Circuit
 23 granted en banc review in *Hayward v. Marshall*, 512 F.3d 536 (9th Cir. 2008), *reh'g en banc*
 24 granted, __ F.3d __, 2008 WL 2131400 (9th Cir. filed May 16, 2008), and oral argument is set
 25 for June 24, 2008. The en banc court in *Hayward* may decide whether this Court has jurisdiction
 26 over this case, and the appropriate standard to be applied if there is jurisdiction. Therefore,
 27 Respondent requests a stay of this case pending the issuance of the mandate in *Hayward*.

28 //

ARGUMENT

I.

THE COURT SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION AND STAY THIS MATTER PENDING ISSUANCE OF THE MANDATE IN *Hayward* BECAUSE BOTH THE BALANCE OF THE INTERESTS AND CONSIDERATIONS OF JUDICIAL ORDER AND ECONOMY FAVOR GRANTING A STAY.

A trial court has discretion to ensure the just and efficient determination of a case by staying it pending the resolution of other proceedings where a stay would be “efficient for [the court’s] docket and the fairest course for the parties.” *Leyva v. Certified Grocers of Cal.*, 593 F.2d 857, 863 (9th Cir. 1979). In determining whether to grant a stay, a court should consider the possible damage that may result, the hardship or inequity that a party may suffer, and the orderly course of justice, in terms of simplifying or complicating the issues, proof, and questions of law, that could result from the issuance of a stay. *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1109, 1111 (9th Cir. 2005). A court should also take into account the existence of similar cases that are pending in the same district court, and the probability that more are likely to be filed. *Id.* Staying cases that are on the forefront of an issue provides a necessary delay, allowing for resolution of the issues and resulting in uniform treatment of like suits. *Id.*

17 As the resolution of *Hayward* could significantly impact this case and numerous similar
18 cases and issuing a stay would prevent unfairness and serve the interests of judicial economy, the
19 Court should exercise its discretion and stay this matter pending the issuance of the mandate in
20 *Hayward*.

A. Moving Forward with This Case Before the Finality of *Hayward* Does Not Serve the Interest of Judicial Economy.

Granting a stay in this case serves the interests of judicial order and economy. On May 16, 2008, the Ninth Circuit granted rehearing en banc in *Hayward*. (Ex. 1.) At issue before the en banc panel in *Hayward* are two threshold issues which are necessary to the resolution of this case: 1) whether California has created a federally protected liberty interest in parole for life inmates, and 2) if a liberty interest is created, what process is due under clearly established

1 Supreme Court authority. Resolution of these issues could establish that Petitioner does not have
2 a federally protected liberty interest in parole, potentially allowing the Court to dismiss his
3 claims for lack of jurisdiction without requiring briefing from the parties. Moreover, it would be
4 wasteful to proceed in this case without the Ninth Circuit's holdings in these matters, as the
5 parties would need to brief issues that will be decided en banc and then submit supplemental
6 briefing to apply the law as clarified in the en banc decision. The two rounds of pleadings may
7 unnecessarily complicate the matters raised and would impair the orderly course of justice.
8 Waiting for the resolution of *Hayward* would thus conserve Court resources, and prevent the
9 Court from having to revisit this matter if *Hayward* is modified or reversed.

10 A stay would also serve judicial order and economy by maintaining uniform treatment of
11 like suits, as once the law is settled it can be uniformly applied. In many habeas petitions
12 challenging California parole decisions, the Ninth Circuit has sua sponte stayed submission of
13 the cases until the resolution of *Hayward*. See, e.g., *Tolliver v. Carey*, no. 07-15347; *Boatman v.*
14 *Brown*, no. 05-16199; *Smiley v. Hernandez*, no. 06-55727; *Valdivia v. Brown*, no. 08-15650;
15 *Johnson v. Newland*, no. 04-16712; *Varner v. Brown*, no. 05-16029; *Johnson v. Finn*, no. 06-
16 17042; *Clark v. Shepherd*, no. 06-55065; *Cooke v. Solis*, no. 06-15444.

17 Granting a stay would therefore conserve judicial resources and serve the Court's interest
18 in orderly managing these proceedings.

19 **B. A Stay Would Not Unfairly Delay Petitioner in Pursuing His Claims.**

20 A stay of this case at the district level would not unfairly impose any additional or
21 otherwise avoidable hardship on Petitioner. As discussed above, if the parties proceed in this
22 case additional briefing will likely be needed after the decision in *Hayward*, perhaps delaying
23 final resolution. Also, even if this court decides this case before *Hayward*, it is likely the losing
24 party will file an appeal, and that appeal may be delayed pending resolution of *Hayward*. (See
25 Arg. I.A.)

26 ///

27 ///

28

Req. for Stay

Cronk v. Ayers
C 07-05313 TEH

CONCLUSION

When the equities are balanced, the parties' interests and the interests of judicial economy support staying this case pending the final resolution of *Hayward*. Staying this case until challenges to *Hayward* are resolved and that decision becomes final promotes the orderly resolution of this matter, and will assist in maintaining uniformity of like suits pending before this Court and similar cases that will be filed in the future. Respondent therefore requests that the Court exercise its discretion to stay this matter pending issuance of the mandate in *Hayward*.

Dated: May 31, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General of the State of California

DANE R. GILLETTE
Chief Assistant Attorney General

JULIE L. GARLAND
Senior Assistant Attorney General

ANYA M. BINSACCA
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

AMANDA J. MURRAY
Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Respondent

40258039.wpd
SE2008401521

Req. for Stay

Cronk v. Ayers
C 07-05313 TEH

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY U.S. MAIL

Case Name: **Ayers v. Cronk**

No.: **C 07-05313 TEH**

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.

On **June 2, 2008**, I served the attached

**RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR STAY PENDING
ISSUANCE OF THE MANDATE IN HAYWARD**

by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General at 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000, San Francisco, CA 94102-7004, addressed as follows:

**Donald Everett Cronk, C-87286
San Quentin State Prison
1 Main Street
San Quentin, CA 94964
In Pro Per**

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on **June 2, 2008**, at San Francisco, California.

M.M. Argarin
Declarant

M.M. Argarin
Signature